

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, January 15, 1997
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

I. INTRODUCTION/SAFETY/CONTINUOUS PROCESS IMPROVEMENT

Lloyd Piper opened the meeting. He stated that this meeting would be our annual self assessment. We would focus on what we are doing, our successes, internal/external communications, and operations. We will also begin each meeting from now on with items on safety and continuous process improvement.

Tom Anderson provided the safety item for this month. It is important that when you become physically and/or mentally tired, you take a break. When you become tired, your mental awareness dulls, leaving you more prone to accidents.

Lloyd Piper provided the continuous process improvement item. Communications to and from the STCG members' organizations are very important. We need to make sure that items discussed at STCG meetings are carried back to the members' organizations and that issues or concerns raised by those organizations are brought to the STCG.

Lloyd asked for introductions around the room. He stated that Ron Izatt had retired from the Government and he was now officially the Deputy Manager. Linda Bauer announced that Fred Serier will be assuming the role of Subcon Subgroup Lead from Donna Wanek.

Shannon stated the meeting purpose and outcome as follows:

Purpose: Annual Self-Assessment

Outcome: Improved STCG Operations

Updates were provided on two recent National Academy of Sciences (NAS) meetings held in Richland. Don Wodrich reported on the meeting with the Tank Subcommittee of the NAS Committee on Environmental Technologies (CEMT). They are charged with advising DOE regarding technology for the TWRS Program. This Subcommittee has a strong interest in considering alternative endstates if the current TWRS baseline plans fail. They will be meeting in March to write the final report on the meeting.

Debbie Trader reported on another CEMT Subcommittee meeting with the Hanford STCG and the Tanks Focus Area (TFA). This Subcommittee is focussed on DOE's decision-making process related to technology development and deployment. They were very interested in the metrics we use to measure success and the technology needs prioritization criteria and weights. The

Subcommittee heard from many STCG members that in spite of the problems they identified with our prioritization process, it does work.

There will be a peer review of In Situ Redox on February 4th and 5th. This will be performed by an ASME committee. There will be final meeting on February 5th, so we will know their findings before they leave.

Shannon asked for feedback from the members on presenting a short monthly technology update on a particular technology being demonstrated or deployed. The members felt this would be a valuable addition to our meetings.

II. SUCSESSES

Linda asked each member to give an indication of the STCG's success by holding up 1-5 fingers. The responses ranged from 1-4.

Shannon presented the following successes/accomplishments of the STCG during the last year:

- Technology and Science Needs
 - Industry
 - Focus Areas
- Hanford Strategic Plan and Ten Year Plan
- Communication Plan
- Hanford Technology Deployment Center
- Vendor Panel: CO₂ and CORPEX
- Focus Area Communications (they all responded to our needs and they all came to Hanford)
- Communications with Other Sites (e.g., national STCG meeting, teleconferences every two weeks, receiving demonstration notices from other DOE sites such as Oakland)
- Proposals and Demonstrations:
 - HTI
 - C-Reactor
 - Macroencapsulation
 - Laser Demonstration
 - Strontium Barrier

- In Situ Redox
 - Hot Spot Removal
 - Non-thermal Treatment of Mixed Waste
 - U-Plant Canyon Large-Scale Demo (pending)
 - 324/325 Large-Scale Demo (pending)
- Out of nine proposals submitted, six awards have been made to Hanford.
 - Leveraged dollars:
 - Focus Areas - ~\$18M
 - Hanford - ~\$15M

After hearing the presentation, the participants were asked again to indicate how successful the STCG had been. Some of the votes decreased, not because of what was done, but because of what wasn't done. The following comments were made by meeting participants:

- Drive from Systems Engineering process
- Identify requirements and endpoints
- Lessons learned from Strontium Barrier
- Need more guidance to Subgroups
- Big picture items (e.g., TWRS Characterization Project vs. groundwater remediation)
- How to get more value from the Laboratory/What is cutting-edge science?
- Funding issues override other important issues
- Regulatory approach (closure, Canyon initiative)
- Need to work in an integrated fashion
- "Outside-of-the-box" thinking
- Better decision-making tools (criteria, weights)
- Look at long-term issues, not just short-term issues
- Pull things back earlier in the schedule
- What are the bounds of the group? (program vs. technology)

- Need to look at the quality of the baseline, not just improving it's efficiency or cost
- Identify the "unknowns" or technology gaps
- View TPA as main driver
- Having end users as Subgroup leads works well
- SWD did Systems Engineering on M-33 and this went into identifying Site needs
- Clarity on how Subgroups interact with Management Council

III. COMMUNICATIONS ISSUES

The participants broke into three groups to brainstorm about internal and external communications. They chose their top issues in each area and developed action plans for these. The groups then reconvened and presented their findings as shown below. The presenters were Tom Tebb (Group 1), Bob Cook (Group 2), and Dirk Dunning (Group 3). Complete details transcribed from the storyboards are included as Attachment 1 to these minutes.

GROUP 1 ACTION PLAN INTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS

LACK OF ISSUE RESOLUTION

- Revisit issues until they are resolved. Make action item assignments. Evaluate each resolution - did it work?
- Have the discipline to commit to resolutions.
- Outstanding issue resolution should be on the Management Council meeting agenda for important issues.

BARRIERS NOT RESOLVED

- Identify rewards for removing barriers. Why take a risk? Failure could also be rewarded to encourage good ideas.

WORKING AS A TEAM ON SHARED GOALS

- The Subgroups are doing good job of working as a team toward shared goals. The Management Council is not doing as well because they are not sure what they should be doing.
- Structure Management Council sessions to have more input to add value.
- Reinforce our shared goals, objectives, and vision. Put a chart on the wall to be seen at every meeting.

GROUP 1 ACTION PLAN EXTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS

FOCUS AREA

- Formalize process so Focus Areas respond to STCG needs letter/package in a timely fashion.
- Request monthly(?) status reports from the Focus Areas.
- The Focus Areas should come here to present or do periodic teleconferences.
- Better lead time for RFPs.
- STCG should present needs to Focus Areas in person.
- Proactive communications of STCG priorities/strategies.

INDUSTRY

- Provide fee incentives to bring vendors in.
- STCG must provide clear requirements and schedules for technology needs.
- Hanford Technology Deployment Center should proactively recruit vendors and maintain better communications with the STCG.
- We need clear points of contact at Hanford for outsiders.
- Subgroups are the key; they must be responsible for these communications occurring.

GROUP 2 ACTION PLAN

INTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS

BETTER DIRECTION/FOCUS

- Review charter/come to consensus
- Set norms
- Evaluate every quarter
- Make sure actions fit goals
- Use Systems Engineering

COMMITMENT TO SUCCESS

- Define success
- Review lessons learned
- Members commit time
- Commit to participate
- Set dates

TIME

- Coordinate communications
- Minutes electronically
- Come to meeting prepared
- Focus meeting minutes on highlights
- Prioritize goals

COMMUNICATIONS WITH OUR OWN ORGANIZATION

**GROUP 2
ACTION PLAN
EXTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS**

- Understanding roles and responsibilities
- Need better Focus Area interactions
- Collaboration with vendors, stakeholders, and regulators

**GROUP 3
ACTION PLAN
INTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS**

- Accelerate the STCG "Learning Curve" of new members; methods for older members to brief new members; visit demo sites.
- Need to communicate what each organization sees as the endstate; use the Future Site Uses Working Group report to start with.
- More time to review pertinent documents to be able to make decisions (from Subgroups to Management Council)
- Implement the Deployment Center

**GROUP 3
ACTION PLAN
EXTERNAL STCG COMMUNICATIONS**

- Implement STCG Communications Plan
- Communicate successes to Congress
- Write letters to others regarding STCG successes and issues.

The facilitation team has the action to integrate and consolidate the common themes and bring 2-3 items back to the Management Council for action.

IV. MANAGEMENT COUNCIL OPERATIONS

The STCG has been operating for two years. Is this method of operations adding value? Some of the areas to be considered were:

- Management Council vs. Subgroup roles
- Frequency and length of meetings
- Who sets the agenda?
- Types of items/presentations/information on agendas
- Amount of detail/policy issues
- Limits/requirements for presentations/proposals
- Voting process
- Role of facilitators

Debbie Trader presented the current set of roles for the Management Council vs. the Subgroups. Then the meeting was opened for discussion. The following comments were captured.

- What is a policy issue? Debatable strategies. The focus is on issues related to technology. Some policy issues must be accepted as "givens".
- Should look beyond baseline boundaries (endstates). Want to add value, improve baseline operations, add quality. Need further discussions of this.
- Keep roles and responsibilities as focus points.
- Agenda items need to be focused on roles and responsibilities.
- Peer review and support technologies that have a good chance of working.
- Bring new members up to speed.
- Revisit roles and responsibilities.
- Focus roles and responsibilities on what we really do.
- Opportunity to communicate and work issues in proactive manner
- Policy issues can be at a technology level.
- Don't do technology in vacuum.
- Look at knowledge gaps (e.g., tank leaks).

- Do not pursue technologies that don't support the baseline.
- Bring in new technology without a champion.
- Need understanding of Subgroup/Management Council roles
- Consistent attendance
- Consider contract reform
- Look at uncertainties and focus on solution and path forward
- Big picture issues
- Look at level of policy issues
- Science vs. Technology
- Focus on deployment
- Work around and through barriers/issues
- Service organization to the line programs
- Strategic Planning for the group (who are the customers?)
- Get definition of public health and safety from DOE, then focus on how we do that job.
- Take advantage of external/informal communications.
- Bring Subgroup decisions (good/bad) to Management Council sooner.
- Agreement on language used.
- Understand where we agree and where we don't.
- Need an implementation strategy for what we have done already.
- Provide executive decision process to make things happen sooner.
- Agenda items that challenge our group
- If there are bodies that already address policy issues (e.g., the HAB), then it should not be our priority.

- When Focus Areas visit, develop list of issue early.
- How to best use members' time
- Characterization Strategy/Corpex/CO₂ - Outcome-oriented agenda
- Small groups to discuss roles and responsibilities, focus agenda, refined roles and responsibilities for further Management Council discussion
- It is difficult to assign actions with this big of a group
- Understand differences
- Have presentations focused on requests.
- Focus Areas provide input in writing.

A committee was formed to review and refine the roles and responsibilities. They will develop a strawman to be distributed to all members for review and comment. This issue will be revisited at the March/April meeting. The committee members are: Lloyd Piper (Chair), Jerry White, Bob Cook, Tom Anderson, Roger Collis, Tom Tebb, Stuart Harris, Paul Danielson, and Dennis Faulk.

V. WRAP-UP

The next meeting will be held on February 19, 1997 from 8:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

February Agenda Items

- Deployment Center and Technology Management Process (PHMC and ERC)
- Close on communication issues
- Technology needs process feedback from Subgroups
- Science needs (if ready)

Future Agenda Items

- Systems Engineering (LMHC) - Integrated Site Baseline (July)
- Focus Area Presentations - Subcon and Mixed Waste (March)

The Subcon Subgroup's proposals will be distributed in writing and voted on by proxy.

Handouts

- Meeting agenda
- December STCG Management Council meeting minutes

Actions

- Request a presentation on the Hanford Site Integrated Baseline later this year (Facilitation Team).
- Integrate/consolidate communications issues for discussion at next meeting (Facilitation Team).
- Request written presentations from the Subcon and Mixed Waste Focus Areas to determine if we want them to be on the March agenda (Donna Wanek/Fred Serier and Joe Waring).
- The Subcon Subgroup will submit their two proposals in writing for Management Council endorsement offline (Donna Wanek/Fred Serier).

Attachment 1

Results from Communication Issues Brainstorming Session

Internal STCG Communications Group 1

Driving Forces

- Trust (3 votes)
- Listening ongoing
- Clear messages and information
Good dialogue/ability to express viewpoints (3 votes)
Layered information--summary, added details, non-jargon
- Practice
- Involvement of regulators, HAB, Tribes, etc. in budget process influences internal communication
- Need to see that involvement has payoff
- Good support from staff
Facilitation
- Management endorsement and participation
- Major impacts to area of responsibility
- Fosters many good behaviors
- Working as a team to identify technology needs (4 votes)
- Alignment sessions
- Shared (common) goals
- Enhance communication - expression of feelings either enhances or detracts from communication

Restraining Forces

- cc:Mail results in lack of face-to-face communication
- Increased responsibility

- Loss of power
- Lack of communication causes further lack of communication
- Different perspective on what the role and purpose of STCG is
- Lack of time - too many meetings, too much paper already (1 vote)
Not enough time
More pre-time to understand issues
Too much on plates most times
- Fear of misuse of information
Fear detracts from communication (1 vote)
- Conflicting priorities - get on with clean-up vs. take time to develop technology
- Barriers are never resolved (4 votes)
- Lack of problem/issue resolution
- Damned for failure; risk-taking not rewarded or tolerated
- Insufficient science and technology expertise (1 vote)
- Difficult to keep big-picture view (1 vote)

External STCG Communications Group 1

Driving Forces

- Proactive publication of activities
Positive messages plan/delivery (3 votes)
- Bi-weekly calls and communications with other STCGs
- Broad range of diverse interests supporting a particular technology need
Full spectrum involvement (2 votes)
- Assigned responsibility to communicate (1 vote)
- Early messages on meetings and needs for response
- Common players with other Site oversight/involvement efforts
- Use of Internet to publicize needs
- Positive impact attracting projects and dollars

- Clear points of contact for STCG/Focus Areas
- Clear requirements and schedules for technology needs
- Recognition/reward system

Restraining Forces

- Privatization efforts vs. proprietary technology
- Insufficient inclusion of expertise outside of DOE/PHMC (2 votes)
Private industry is not always considered for technology development (2 votes)
- "Not invented here" effects
- Lack points of contact
- Management Council doesn't add sufficient value to Subgroup work
- Within agencies, right and left hands need better communication at some levels
- Poor customer communications service
- Meeting minutes are not distributed to all the Focus Areas
- Too many players
- Lack of desire for review of technology (1 vote)
- Broader communication of STCG activities and contributions (not as well known as HAB, for example)
- Members do not report back to their constituencies (2 votes)
- The Focus Areas don't always communicate back to the STCG on their prioritization, IRB, PEG, changes, etc. (4 votes)
- A better link or communication between the STCG and Focus Areas on why something was funded or not (2 votes)
- Not enough big-picture and long-range thinking (3 votes)
- External organizations are not invited to STCG meetings
- Need greater frequency and consistency of messages (1 vote)
- Making needs understood by decision-makers

Internal STCG Communications Group 2

Driving Forces

- Commitment to success (6 votes)
- Good facilitation (2 votes)
- Working towards the same goal; getting stuff done to send in proposals/needs
- Money available
- Understanding the problem (1 vote)
Good clear direction or path forward (3 votes)
Pitfalls
Successes
Timely notification of critical events (2 votes)
- Quality Subgroup leads
- Broad mix of programs/entities involved in STCG - allows for obtaining information
- Better, quicker, cheaper clean-up with new technology (2 votes)
- STCG Council session and discussion/direction/redirection
- Focus Area priority setting, dialogue sessions
- Integrated roles (e.g., TWRS site rep. is STCG Subgroup lead)

Restraining Forces

- No clear direction or path (5 votes)
Lack of understanding of roles and responsibilities (3 votes)
Unfocused expectations of members; too much time for one person (1 vote)
- Time, or lack of, to do everything; no priorities related to realistic goals for the group (2 votes)
Not enough time to effectively communicate (2 votes)
Too many other commitments
- Differing agendas (2 votes)
- Minutes lag too much; not geared toward a “communique”
- Value-added issues (1 vote)
Lower value (importance) seen for STCG

- Short response time for some actions
- Unwillingness to compare drivers of baseline strategies that are inconsistent
- Only communicating through electronic media; sometimes hard to catch people
- Narrow focus on cost reduction and TPA baseline

External STCG Communications Group 2

Driving Forces

- Need to leverage money and capabilities
Potential for additional funding (1 vote)
- Establish/maintain supporting relationships with stakeholders and regulators (4 votes)
- Communication/information from Hanford
- Integrated roles - with outside organizations
- Successes
- Presentations by Focus Areas to Management Council or Subgroups (1 vote)
- There are some entities (EM-50) listening/monitoring STCG (1 vote)
- Close/personal interaction with Focus Areas (1 vote)
- Home page/Internet allows for greater exchange of information
- Partnerships with ETP and other state/commercial entities
Vendor connection
Collaboration (4 votes)
- Ability to influence (Focus Areas/EM-50, EMSP) (1 vote)
- Obtain fiscal support from HQ/Congress (3 votes)
- Good headquarters communication of issues

Restraining Forces

- Lack of understanding of the purpose of the STCG (4 votes)
Lack of understanding of roles
Roles and responsibilities unclear
Poor specification of requirements (3 votes)

- Different agendas/goals (5 votes)
- Unreal expectations of the STCG
- Need to improve internal communications first
- Inward focus
- Lack of DOE Office of External Affairs/Communications participation
- Competing drivers for projects vs. technology
- Need to reach out to other organizations
- Time and distance
- No formal forum to do so (i.e., conference call)
- Don't have enough interaction with Focus Areas; they have not been responsive (4 votes)
- Lack of requested feedback

Internal STCG Communications Group 3

Driving Forces

- Involve project managers/unit managers of a site on any technology issues which will effect them (1 vote)
- Make a difference in clean-up (better, faster, cheaper)
- Simple, short messages--limit to what audience needs to know, not what you would like to say
- Strength of Hanford STCG recommendations recognized nationally (1 vote)
- Need to understand the problem
- Ideas, no matter how simple, must be considered
- Integration needs
- Excessive focus on surrogate measures (\$ vs. health vs. environment vs. ...) (1 vote)
- User champions
- Endpoints defined

- Support from stakeholders
- User integration (1 point)
- Single points of contact
- Timeliness for decision-making
- Innovative ideas that need further discussion and analysis need more support
- The "learning curve" of what the STCG can do is slowly being realized (2 votes)
- Potential effectiveness of solutions

Restraining Forces

- Mission, charter of STCG established before many members joined
- No hardwired tools/pathway for group use
- Time constraints, information overload in four hours/month
- Unclear detailed roles and responsibilities
- Lack of empowerment of the Subgroups (1 vote)
- Risk aversion
- Too conventional in approach
- Lack of leadership (1 vote)
- Not enough "out-of-the-box" thinking
- Distrust
- Short-term vision
- Field managers' observations are diluted/ignored by upper management
- Time - People have many other demands and do not have time to listen or communicate
- The endstate conditions of the Site are not clearly a part of the planning and technology decisions (1 vote)

- Excessive near-term focus (1 vote)
- Lack of information to be able to make informed decisions (2 votes)
- Lack of authority from parent organization (2 votes)
- Lack of information--needs, abilities, funding, possibilities
- Politically driven process
- This is an EM-50 driven initiative
- Unequal base of knowledge among members
- Too many competing activities
- Attendance is not consistent
- Lack of focus on endstate requirements (3 votes)
- Inadequate analysis
- Lack of concern/desire from parent organization
- Potential risk of failure from lack of detailed understanding
- Members should bring expertise on the subject to be discussed either in the Subgroup or Management Council
- Potential risks of failure with lack of information
- Need for integration of technology needs in decision-making
- Not enough humor (3 votes)

External STCG Communications Group 3

Driving Forces

- Integration with other groups (other STCGs, HAB, Regulators, TPA, Hanford Natural Resources Trustees Council, DOE Management Council)
- Need for broad communication with other organizations
- Means to bring in external ideas/technologies
- Generate simple, short messages (focused examples)
- Work more closely with Clyde Frank's Community Leaders Network
- Increase communication with other Federal departments and follow-up
- Bring in outside concerns
- Closer links to other sites, STCGs, and national Focus Areas
- Communication to external audience of a results-oriented process
- Ease of access to information about STCG and its plans/past actions
- Continue national Focus Area site-to-site communication
- Northwest Congressional delegation/stakeholders/regulators/Tribes agree on endpoints

Restraining Forces

- Lack of information to make informed decisions
- "Not invented here" syndrome
- STCG needs to establish its importance in the main stream of Hanford clean-up through communication
- Hanford culture is too inbred
- Hanford Advisory Board needs to be kept informed of the work of STCG by its representatives--there has been very little communication